JUN 2 5 2004

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF (Large Entity)

Docket No.
121027-069

In Re Application Of: Satoru TANGE

Application No.	Filing Date	Examiner	Customer No.	Group Art Unit	Confirmation No.
~~09/994,477~~ 09/944,477	August 31, 2001	Jeff Aftergut	35684	1733	

Invention:

PROCESS FOR MANUFACTURING ELASTICALLY STRETCHABLE AND CONTRACTIBLE COMPOSITE SHEET

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Transmitted herewith in triplicate is the Appeal Brief in this application, with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on

The fee for filing this Appeal Brief is: $330.00

- ☐ A check in the amount of the fee is enclosed.
- ☐ The Director has already been authorized to charge fees in this application to a Deposit Account.
- ☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 12-2136

Michael S. Gzybowski

Signature

Dated: June 23, 2004

I certify that this document and fee is being deposited on June 23, 2004 with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Michael S. Gzybowski

Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence

Michael S. Gzybowski

Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence

CC:

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Group Art Unit:	1733
Attorney Docket No.:	121027-069
Applicant:	Satoru TANGE
Invention:	PROCESS FOR MANUFACTURING ELASTICALLY STRETCHABLE AND CONTRACTIBLE COMPOSITE SHEET
Serial No:	~~09/994,477~~ 09/944477
Filed:	August 31, 2001
Examiner:	Jeff Aftergut

Certificate Under 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on June 23, 2004

Michael K Gzybowski

Michael S. Gzybowski

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Further to appellant's Notice of Appeal filed March 24, 2004 in connection with the above-identified application, appellant submits the present Brief on Appeal.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Appellant has assigned this application to Uni-Charm Corporation in an assignment which was executed by the inventor on March 12, 2001, and filed in the United States Patent and

6/29/2004 AWONDAF1 00000097 122136 09994477

1 FC:1402 330.00 DA

Trademark Office on January 4, 2002, and recorded on February 4, 2002 at Reel No. 012596 and Frame No. 0057.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related applications that are on appeal or involved in any interference.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-5 are pending in this application. Claims 1-5 stand under final rejection, from which final rejection of claims 1-5 this appeal is taken. No other claims are pending.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were filed in this application after Final Rejection.

SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present invention is directed to a process for manufacturing a composite sheet that is capable of elastic stretch and contract in at least one direction. As disclosed in the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of appellant's specification, the composite sheet comprises an upper layer 2 (see Fig. 1) that comprises a mass of thermoplastic synthetic fibers that extend continuously between

bond areas 4 (see Fig. 1). The thermoplastic synthetic fibers are preferably continuous fibers 6 (see Fig. 1) which are fused to each other at bond areas 4, but are individualized between bond areas 4 such that they are neither fused nor mechanically entangled tightly with each other.

As disclosed in the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7, the lower layer 3 (see Fig. 1) of the composite sheet 1 is elastically stretchable and contractible in at least one and preferable two directions. The lower layer 3 comprises a mass of short, long or continuous fibers made of elastic materials such as thermoplastic elastomers, or alternatively comprises a film or the like made of such elastic materials. In the case of fibers, the lower layer 3 can be a non-woven or woven fabric, preferably via integration of fibers by fusion or mechanical entanglement.

Figure 2 is a diagram that illustrates the manufacturing process.

As discussed in the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of appellant's specification in reference to Fig. 2, a first web 41a is fed in a machine direction and subject to a first extension step 46. As discussed in the full paragraph on page 8 of appellant's specification in reference to Fig. 2, the first web 41a is superimposed with a second web 52a, and the superimposed structure is subjected to a bonding process that forms bond areas 4. After bonding, the composite is subjected to a second extension step 56.

As discussed in the paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9 of appellant's specification in reference to Fig. 2, the composite is released from tension.

As disclosed in the paragraph bridging pages 15 and 16 of appellant's specification, the fibers of the second web are freed from engagement and individualized in the second extension step 56.

ISSUE

Whether claims 1-5 are unpatentable over Ness in view of Sisson further optionally taken with Austin et al. under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

GROUPING OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ness in view of Sisson further optionally taken with Austin et al. and therefore stand or fall together.

THE REFERENCES

The following references are relied upon by the examiner:

U.S. 5,543,206	Austin et al.	Aug. 6, 1996
U.S. 4,525,407	Ness.	Jun. 25, 1985
U.S. 4,107,364	Sisson.	Aug. 15, 1978

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE REFERENCES

Austin et al. discloses a nonwoven composite sheet that, as depicted in Fig 1 includes a nonelastic layer 11 that is bonded to an extensible web 12 by an adhesive layer 13. The nonelastic layer 11 includes a plurality of intermediate bond "B" which maintain the strength and integrity of the fabric while allowing the continuous filaments of the nonelastic layer 11 to elongate throughout the full extent of stretching.

The embodiment of Austin et al. shown in Fig. 2 includes an additional nonelastic layer 14 that is bonded to extensible web 12 by adhesive layer 15.

As stated at column 5, lines 15-20 of Austin et al.:

> In assembling the composite fabric 10, layers 11 and 12 are provided in a relaxed state from individual supply rolls. Adhesive is then applied over the surface of the extensible web12 or fibrous layer 11. Soon after the adhesive is applied, the layers are subject thus to forming the fabric 10. For example, the layers can be fed through calendar nip rolls.

Ness discloses an elastic composite that comprises an elastic member 10 and a substrate 12 that may "comprise a woven, nonwoven, knitted or fusible fabric with the *requisite extensibility and elastic recovery*." That is, before the substrate is stretched, it is "less easily extensible than the elastic member and has less elastic recovery than the elastic member."

Ness teaches that according to one embodiment an unstretched elastic member is intermittently bonded to an unstretched non-gathered substrate. Afterwards selected areas of the composite may be stretched to selected degree to give the composite an adjustable elasticity.

According to another embodiment, Ness teaches that the "a partially stretched elastic member is intermittently bonded to a substrate which, prior to stretching, is less easily extensible than the elastic member to form an elastic composite, and thereafter stretching selected areas of the composite to a selected degree."

Sisson discloses a random laid bonded continuous filament cloth. In the embodiment of Sisson depicted in Fig. 19 (specifically relied upon by the examiner) is "another apparatus similar to the apparatus of FIG. 6 for producing a three layer, laminated, continuous filament bonded cloth in accordance herewith."

The apparatus depicted in Fig. 19 of Sisson forms separate streams of non-elastic monofilaments 40 and elastomeric monofilaments 42. The non-elastic monofilaments 40 are drawn between draw roll sets 44 to reduce each filament to textile denier. The elastomeric monofilaments 42 are drawn between draw roll sets 46 to reduce each filament to textile denier.

After the filaments 40 and 42 are drawn to a desired diameter they are laid down on a forming surface 56 to form an unbonded web 60' "for bonding and stretching, as by use of the remainder of the apparatus 30 shown in FIG. 6."

The apparatus depicted in Fig. 19 does not form a web capable of elastic stretch that is first stretched and thereafter superimposed and bonded to an inelastic web.

THE REJECTIONS

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ness in view of Sisson further optionally taken with Austin et al.

The examiner has relied upon Ness as teaching that it was known at the time of appellant's invention to:

> ...form a composite elastic which included the steps of providing an elastic material and intermittently bonding the elastic to a nonwoven fabric on both upper and lower surfaces of the elastic material.

The examiner has further relied Ness as suggesting that:

> ...the substrate which was to be gathered after the lamination operation was formed from nonwoven materials.

And that:

...prior to the lamination operation, the elastic material was either in a non-stretched or partially stretched condition.

The examiner has further relied upon Ness as suggesting that:

...those skilled in the art would have stretched the assembly subsequent to the bonding operation (whether one partially stretched the elastic or fed the elastic in an unstretched condition to the laminating mechanism).

The examiner has relied upon Sisson as suggesting that:

...it was known to intermittently bond a nonwoven of elastic filaments to a nonwoven of inelastic by elongtable filaments.

And that:

...those skilled in the art would have bonded the nonwoven elastic web 24 with the nonelastic web 22 at cross over points 26 wherein the bonding would have been at discrete locations.

The examiner has further relied upon Sisson as suggesting that:

...after formation one skilled in the art would have stretched the web wherein the nonelastic web would have been elongated and oriented as depicted in Figure 2. after retraction of the elastic (contraction) subsequent to elongation, the inelastic filaments 22 loop, bulk and bunch up.

The examiner states:

...applicant is advised that one viewing Ness would have understood that the nonwoven materials of Sisson would have been useful in the operation as puckering was desired in the finished assembly.

In combining the teachings of Ness and Sisson the examiner takes the position that:

...it would have been obvious....to employ the nonwoven web of Sisson in the process of Ness for making a textured and puckered elastic composite web.

Austin et al. has been relied upon as suggesting that:

> ...those skilled in the art would have known to utilize continuous filaments for the nonwoven layer 11 which is suitably formed via a spun bonding operation and then thermally bonded using conventional processing.

The examiner has further relied upon Austin et al. as suggesting that:

> ...two webs of different properties would have been joined upon opposite sides of the elastic material such as described with reference to webs 11 and 14....which included blends of polyethylene and polypropylene.

The examiner as further relied upon Austin et al. as suggesting that:

> ...subsequent to the stretching operation, the inelastic fibrous webs were stretched beyond their elastic limit and distorted as a result of the same.

In combining the teachings of Ness, Sisson and Austin et al. the examiner takes the position that:

> It would have been obvious....to employ the fibrous webs of material described by Austin et al in the manufacture of a composite laminate which included an elastic central core material wherein the same was stretched bonded with both preliminary stretching of the elastic prior to stretching followed by stretching subsequent to the formation of the composite.

ARGUMENT

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art relied upon by the examiner does not render appellant's claimed invention obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) inasmuch as none of the references alone or in combination teach or otherwise suggest the process and structural limitations set for in appellant's pending claims.

As noted above, the examiner has relied Ness as teaching that it was known at the time of appellant's invention to:

> ...form a composite elastic which included the steps of providing an elastic material and intermittently bonding the elastic to a nonwoven fabric on both upper and lower surfaces of the elastic material.

The examiner has further relied Ness as suggesting that:

> ...the substrate which was to be gathered after the lamination operation was formed from nonwoven materials

And that:

> ...prior to the lamination operation, the elastic material was either in a non-stretched or partially stretched condition.

The examiner has further relied upon Ness as suggesting that:

> ...those skilled in the art would have stretched the assembly subsequent to the bonding operation (whether one partially stretched the elastic or fed the elastic in an unstretched condition to the laminating mechanism).

Ness does teach that the substrate can "comprise a woven, nonwoven, knitted or fused fabric with the *required extensibility and elastic recovery* – i.e. before the substrate is stretched, it is "less easily extensible than the elastic member and has less elastic recovery than the elastic member."

Ness also teaches that the composites can be fabricated by bonding the elastic member to the substrate while the elastic member is unstretched or partially stretched.

Ness fails to teach several of the last steps in appellant's claimed method which involve extending the composite web in the one direction within a range that permits elastic stretch and contraction of the first web (step (g)) and allowing the extended composite web to retract by an

elastic contraction force of the first web to thereby obtain a composite sheet in which individual thermoplastic fibers of the second web are neither fused nor mechanically entangled tightly with each other between discrete areas where the first and second webs are joined together in step (d) (step (h)).

In recognizing the difference between Ness and the appellant's claimed invention the examiner has relied upon Sisson as suggesting that:

> ...it was known to intermittently bond a nonwoven of elastic filaments to a nonwoven of inelastic by elongtable filaments.

And that:

> ...those skilled in the art would have bonded the nonwoven elastic web 24 with the nonelastic web 22 at cross over points 26 wherein the bonding would have been at discrete locations.

The examiner has further relied upon Sisson as suggesting that:

> ...after formation one skilled in the art would have stretched the web wherein the nonelastic web would have been elongated and oriented as depicted in Figure 2. after retraction of the elastic (contraction) subsequent to elongation, the inelastic filaments 22 loop, bulk and bunch up.

The examiner states:

> ...applicant is advised that one viewing Ness would have understood that the nonwoven materials of Sisson would have been useful in the operation as puckering was desired in the finished assembly.

In combining the teachings of Ness and Sisson the examiner takes the position that:

> ...it would have been obvious....to employ the nonwoven web of Sisson in the process of Ness for making a textured and puckered elastic composite web.

In response to the Office Action mailed November 28, 2003 appellant argued in reference to Fig. 6 of Sisson that appellant's invention involved a process in which the first web is

stretched in step (b), then superimposed and bonded to a second web in step (d) (while in an extended state as discussed on page 8, lines 2-4 and depicted in Fig. 2) to form a composite web which is further stretched in step (e).

In further reference to Fig. 6 of Sisson, appellant argued that the manner in which the Sisson combines two separate streams of monofilaments to form a single web does not teach appellant's claimed invention.

In the Advisory Action mailed March 8, 2004 the examiner stated:

> The applicant argues that the reference to Sisson does not envision the use of multiple layers of material wherein one layer is elastic and an adjacent layer is inelastic but elongatable, however such was clearly suggested by Figure 19. The applicant's arguments relating to Figure 6 of Sisson are not understood as reliance upon the same was not made by the examiner.

At column 36, lines 28-62 Sisson teaches:

> Accordingly, and with reference now to FIG. 19, there is shown and illustrated apparatus generally designated by the reference character 30' <u>substantially similar to the apparatus of FIG. 6</u> but for simultaneously extruding, drawing or drafting and forwarding three distinct streams of filaments to form a three layered unbonded web for bonding and stretching, as by use of the remainder of the apparatus 30 shown in FIG. 6. The apparatus 30' may, more particularly, produce a three layered cloth structure having a relatively elastomeric filament layer laminated between two relatively non-elastic filament layers.
>
> In FIG. 19, and in the following description, the apparatus 30' is <u>identical to the apparatus 30 except where specific differences are pointed out.</u> Accordingly, like reference characters are utilized in FIG. 19 as in FIG. 6. Hence, an extruder 34 for the elastomeric polymer is provided disposed between a pair of extruders 32 for the non-elastic polymer. The extruder 34 separately extrudes a stream of elastomeric filaments 42 between a pair of streams of non-elastic filaments 40 separately extruded by the extruders 32. Separate drawing or drafting of the stream of filaments is provided by a single set of draw rolls 46 for the elastomeric filaments provided positioned between a pair of sets 44 of draw rolls for the non-elastic filaments. Three separate aspirators 52 or other forwarding devices are provided for successively depositing a non-elastic layer, an elastomeric layer and a second non-elastic layer

over the vacuum box 56 onto the forming wire or screen 54 to produce a three layered unbonded web 65 for subsequent bonding in the bonding nip 62, stretching in the stretch roll section 66 and windup on the take-up roll 70. Belt forwarding may also be used.

The examiner's position taken in combining the teachings of Ness and Sisson that:

...it would have been obvious....to employ the nonwoven web of Sisson in the process of Ness for making a textured and puckered elastic composite web.

fails to consider that only "web" produced by combining the streams of monofilaments 42 and 40 in the embodiments of Figs. 6 or 19 is a "web" in which the elastomeric monofilaments 42 and non-elastic monofilaments 40 are "randomly looped and dispersed on the forming surface [54]."

Or as stated at column 19, lines 32-35 of Sisson:

The forwarding velocity may provide dispersion and fiber distribution by looping and random laydown of the filaments 40 and 42 on the forming surface 54.

Following at column 19, lines 40-43 Sisson teaches:

After laydown on the forming surface 54, the unbonded web 60 is bonded in a heated bonding nip 62 within the forming section 58 to produce a coherent autogenously bonded cloth web 64.

The "nonwoven web of Sisson" is disclosed as being a cloth web per the Title – "Random Laid Bonded Continuous Filament Cloth."

There does not appear to be any particular benefit to using the finished bonded cloth of Sisson as the substrate in Ness.

Sisson is directed at forming a nonwoven fabric that is relatively inexpensive as compared to conventional knitted and woven fabrics (see column 1, line 65-68) which nonwoven fabrics have the

drape, hand, appearance, elasticity and strength of knitted and woven cloth (see column 2, lines 17-20).

There is no motivation within the teachings of Ness and Sisson to incorporate the finished cloth of Sisson in the elastic compositions of Ness.

Moreover, even if the cloth of Sisson were incorporated into Ness the combination would fail to meet the limitation of appellant's independent claim 1 which requires that extending the composite web in the one direction within a range that permits elastic stretch and contraction of the first web (step (g)) and allowing the extended composite web to retract by an elastic contraction force of the first web to thereby obtain a composite sheet in which individual thermoplastic fibers of the second web are neither fused nor mechanically entangled tightly with each other between discrete areas where the first and second webs are joined together in step (d) (step (h)).

If the cloth of Sisson where incorporated as the substrate in Ness, it would have to be interpreted as appellant's second web. In such an instance the cloth of Sisson would fail to meet the requirement that "individual thermoplastic fibers of the second web are neither fused nor mechanically entangled tightly with each other between discrete areas where the first and second webs are joined together."

At column 14, lines 7-14 Sisson teaches that:

> When the stretch bonded cloth 20 is released, the elastomeric filaments 24 retract the cloth to approximately its original area dimensions. The non-elastic filaments 21, however, do not retract and the retraction of the elastomeric filaments 24 is effective to cause looping, bulking and bunching of the non-elastic filaments 22, as shown in FIG. 3, as the bond points 26 return to substantially their original positions.

It is this clear that the individual filaments or thermoplastic fibers of Sisson would be both fused and mechanically entangled tightly with each other between intermediate locations where the cloth of Sisson would be joined to the elastic member of Ness.

In fact, the manner in which Sisson loops the filaments as they are being laid down and the manner in which bond points 26 are formed together ensure that, upon stretching the cloth will become "looped, bulked and bunched between the bond points" as taught at column 8, lines 28-61.

At column 8, lines 62-68 Sisson does teach that some of the bonds between the thermoplastic fibers and elastic fibers may break. However, Sisson teaches that the bond strength "is sufficient to enable the non-elastic fibers to be stretched between said bonds without, in a majority of instances, breaking those bonds."

So it is established that the majority of bonds in the cloth of Sisson are not broken so that the individual filaments are both fused and entangled tightly.

It is important to note that Figs. 1 and 2 of Sisson shows that each individual fiber has multiple fusion or bond points. Therefore if less that a majority of the bonds or joints are broken, the remaining majority would most likely cause virtually all the individual fibers to be bonded or joined together.

Therefore the fibers would certainly not be "individualized" as required by appellant's dependent claim 2.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the combination of Ness and Sisson is not supported by any motivation found in the teachings of Ness and Sisson and absent reliance upon appellant's own disclosure.

Moreover, it is submitted that even if the teachings of Ness and Sisson were combined in the manner suggested by the examiner, the resulting combination would flail to anticipate or render obvious appellant's claimed invention.

Austin has been relied upon as suggesting that:

> ...those skilled in the art would have known to utilize continuous filaments for the nonwoven layer 11 which is suitably formed via a spun bonding operation and then thermally bonded using conventional processing.

The examiner has further relied upon Austin as suggesting that:

> ...two webs of different properties would have been joined upon opposite sides of the elastic material such as described with reference to webs 11 and 14....which included blends of polyethylene and polypropylene.

The examiner as further relied upon Austin as suggesting that:

> ...subsequent to the stretching operation, the inelastic fibrous webs were stretched beyond their elastic limit and distorted as a result of the same.

In combining the teachings of Ness, Sisson and Austin et al. the examiner takes the position that:

> It would have been obvious....to employ the fibrous webs of material described by Austin et al in the manufacture of a composite laminate which included an elastic central core material wherein the same was stretched bonded with both preliminary stretching of the elastic prior to stretching followed by stretching subsequent to the formation of the composite.

The undersigned is not familiar with the practice of relying upon an "optional" prior art reference (particularly "further optionally") in a rejection and would appreciate a brief comment on this practice. To the undersigned, it seems like "optionally" relying upon Austin et al. infers that the

combination of Ness and Sisson was insufficient to reject the claims. If this is the case, then reliance upon Austin et al. is not "optional."

In Austin et al. the nonelastic layer 11 "may comprise discrete staple fibers or continuous filaments." (See column 3, lines 8-11).

As taught by Austin et al. at column 3, lines 17-21:

> After filament collection, any thermal or chemical bonding treatment may be used to form a plurality of intermittent bond, indicated by the reference character B in FIG. 1, such that a coherent structure results. In this regard, thermal point bonding is most preferred.

The examiner has "further optionally" relied upon Austin et al. as suggesting that:

> ...those skilled in the art would have known to utilize continuous filaments for the nonwoven layer 11 which is suitably formed via a spun bonding operation and then thermally bonded using conventional processing.

Based upon this reliance, the examiner takes the position that:

> It would have been obvious....to employ the fibrous webs of material described by Austin et al in the manufacture of a composite laminate which included an elastic central core material wherein the same was stretched bonded with both preliminary stretching of the elastic prior to stretching followed by stretching subsequent to the formation of the composite.

This position completely overlooks the fact that, although Austin et al. teaches that nonelastic layer 11 can be made from continuous filaments (or discrete staple fibers), Austin et al. requires intermittent bonds "B."

The presence of intermittent bonds "B" would result in a combination of Ness, Sisson and Austin et al. that would fail to meet the requirement of appellant's independent claim 1 that the

individual thermoplastic fibers of the second web are neither fused nor mechanically entangled tightly with each other between discrete areas where the first and second webs are joined together.

Moreover, the fibers would not be individualized as required by dependent claim 2.

It is further noted that the manner in which the examiner purports to combine the teachings of Ness, Sisson and Austin et al. is not clearly understood.

The undersigned has interpreted the examiner's suggested combination to involve:

1) "employ[ing] the nonwoven web of Sisson in the process of Ness for making a textured and puckered elastic composite web" and

2) "further optionally" "employ the fibrous webs of material described by Austin et al in the manufacture of a composite laminate which included an elastic central core material wherein the same was stretched bonded with both preliminary stretching of the elastic prior to stretching followed by stretching subsequent to the formation of the composite."

It is not clear if the examiner suggests employing the nonwoven web of Sisson and the fibrous webs of Austin et al. in the process of Ness, or the fibers of Austin et al. in the nonwoven web or Sisson and then imports this combination into Ness. Note Austin et al. has not been relied upon in the alternative, but "further optionally."

CONCLUSION

For the reasons advanced above, appellant respectfully contends that the rejection of claims 1-5 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ness in view of Sisson further optionally taken

with Austin et al. is improper because the examiner has not met his burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Reversal of the rejection on appeal is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 12-2136 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael S. Gzybowski
Reg. No. 32,816

BUTZEL LONG
350 South Main Street
Suite 300
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
(734) 995-3110

113631.1

CLAIMS ON APPEAL

Claim 1. A process for manufacturing a composite sheet capable of elastic stretch and contract in one direction, said process comprising:

(a) continuously feeding, in the one direction, a first web capable of elastic stretch and contraction and having a top surface and a bottom surface;

(b) extending said first web in the one direction within a range that permits elastic stretch and contraction of the first web;

(c) continuously feeding a second web capable of inelastic extension and composed of thermoplastic fibers along the one direction;

(d) superimposing said second web on at least one surface of the extended first web and joining said second web to the first web in an intermittent manner along the one direction to provide a composite web;

(e) extending the composite web in the one direction within a range that permits elastic stretch and contraction of the first web; and

(f) allowing the extended composite web to retract by an elastic contraction force of the first web to thereby obtain a composite sheet in which individual thermoplastic fibers of the second web are neither fused nor mechanically entangled tightly with each other between discrete areas where the first and second webs are joined together in step (d).

Claim 2. The process of Claim 1, wherein said thermoplastic synthetic fibers of the second web are engaged with each other by mechanical entanglement or fusion bonding and in step (e), the thermoplastic synthetic fibers are partly freed from the engagement to the extent that they individualized.

Claim 3. The process of Claim 1, wherein two second webs are provided with one second web joined to the top surface of the first web and another second web joined to the bottom surface of the first web, and the second webs respectively joined to the top and bottom surfaces of the first web being distinguished from each other by at least one property selected from the groups consisting of basis weight, density, type of the thermoplastic synthetic resin, diameter, and length of the fibers thereof.

Claim 4. The process of Claim 1, wherein said first web comprises at least one of an elastically stretchable fabric composed of thermoplastic synthetic fibers and an elastically stretchable film made of a thermoplastic synthetic resin.

Claim 5. The process of Claim 1, wherein said thermoplastic synthetic fibers in the second web comprise continuous fibers.